

March 1, 2007

VIA FACSIMILE AND E-MAIL

To: The Parties of PSC Docket No. 07-20*

**Re: In the Matter of Integrated Resource Planning for the
Provision of Standard Offer Supply Service by Delmarva
Power & Light Company Under 26 Del. C. § 1007(c) & (d);
Review of Initial Resource Plan Submitted December 1, 2006
(Opened January 23, 2007); PSC Docket No. 07-20**

Dear Parties:

This letter constitutes my rulings on the six intervention petitions identified in my February 26th letter.

I approve Bluewater Wind's petition (for the reasons stated therein), so that Bluewater Wind may represent its economic interests as a potential supplier of electricity in Delaware and as a bidder in the RFP docket.

I approve NRG Energy's petition (for the reasons stated therein), so that NRG Energy may represent its economic interests as a supplier of electricity in Delaware and as a bidder in the RFP docket.

I approve the petition from the Sustainable Energy Utility Task Force (for the reasons stated therein), so that the Task Force can represent its interest in developing a sustainable energy utility for Delaware.

I approve, under certain conditions, Dr. Firestone's, Mr. Muller's and Ms. McGonegal's petitions, so that they may represent their interests as residents of Delaware concerned with the IRP's impact on the environment and public health. (See the Commission's *Rules of Practice and Procedure*, Rule 21(d), authorizing the Hearing Examiner to prescribe reasonable conditions on the approval of intervention petitions.)

To: The Parties of PSC Docket No. 07-20

March 1, 2007

Page 2

Because their interests in the IRP as Delaware residents concerned with the environment are substantially the same, Dr. Firestone, Mr. Muller and Ms. McGonegal may act as one party, with one voice. As such, they will submit one filing with each deadline and will appear as one party at all proceedings. In this way, we will not have parties whose interests are represented by other parties (as referenced in Rule 21(a)(iii)) and we can avoid duplicative submissions and responses throughout the life of this docket.

Dr. Firestone, Mr. Muller and Ms. McGonegal should confer with each other and advise me, with the March 7th filing in this case, who their lead representative will be. The lead representative's name will be the name of the party. In the event that they cannot agree, I will direct Dr. Firestone as the lead, for the reasons stated in his intervention petition, at paragraphs 26, and 34 through 46 (and because his was the only intervention petition of the three that was filed in compliance with the "original and ten (10) copies" requirement of Rule 6(c), which requirement was highlighted in e-mails dated February 19 and February 23, 2007). If any of the three would prefer not to participate in this manner, then I can move that individual (or individuals) to the "non-party, e-mail only" portion of the service list, if they wish. In this way, they will receive copies of all the submissions and can be heard separately as non-party members of the public.

As provided in Rule 21(c), these rulings are subject to interlocutory appeal to the Commission pursuant to Rule 28. Interlocutory appeals are due within three days of this ruling (not counting the weekend) and should be filed in accordance with Rule 28 (Interlocutory Appeals) and Rule 6 (Filing of Documents). Responses to an interlocutory appeal are due within three days of the service of the appeal (see Rule 28) and should be filed in accordance with Rule 28 and Rule 6.

Very truly yours,

William F. O'Brien
Hearing Examiner

*See attached service list